20c NOVEMBER 13, 1950

New Republic

CAN FREE INDIA SURVIVE? By MICHAEL STRAIGHT

BERNARD SHAW'S WORLD—AND OURS AN EDITORIAL

HOW STRONG IS RUSSIA'S ECONOMY? By KARL SCHOLZ

HAROLD L. ICKES ON: ELECTION AFTERMATH

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WHY THE NEW REPUBLIC Is Important to Me

The winner of first prize in The New Republic's Contest

By RUTH A. PUTMAN

The other day a friend said to me, "I want you to send in my name to that New Republic you are always quoting. It makes sense to me."

Well, that subscription is the province of another department, but she was voicing the main reason "Why the New Republic Is Important to Me." It makes sense.

I have read that art ministers to man's need to see relationships, to understand the significance of what daily takes place around him. In a sense, the New Republic performs this function of a work of art: in its weekly articles and especially in its special supplements, it shows me relationships and significances of which I might otherwise be unaware.

I think it's my duty to be a well informed citizen but I see no reason why I should be bored to death in the process of becoming one. That's another reason why I'm enthusiastic about the New Republic. Its literary quality gives me an aesthetic pleasure quite aside from that solid satisfaction I gain from learning what is going on in the world. To me, the columns of "Honest Harold" Ickes smack of the crisp comments once written by William Blake on the margins of books.

Although a lot of the books reviewed in The New Republic sound as though they are beyond my depth, I know if they make its columns at all they are worth reading and I am glad to know about them. When I do read one of them I am always impressed by what I consider your magazine's fair and intelligent appraisal of them. Your reviewers never exhibit two faults which annoy me so much in other reviewers: a tendency to praise a book with the biggest ad or to knock one simply because its author has now arrived and is fair game for a lot of jealous people who wish they could write as well. To illustrate: the recent article on Robert Penn Warren's *World Enough and Time* seemed to me the fairest of the many reviews I read of it; your author showed that he had both carefully read Mr. Warren's book and sympathetically understood it. I might name other articles on the theatre, music, movies, and the radio, all of which reveal a positive approach, an effort to find what is good and give credit where credit is due.

Not only what it has, but what it has *not*, appeals to me in The New Republic—pictures of corpses in the middle of traffic, notables photographed in embarrassing moments, movie queens with their beautiful legs. I dislike cute headlines, quizzes for testing my mate, ads for things I shouldn't buy, and magazines that make me think I'm playing paper dolls. After skidding through one of those gaudy slicks what a pleasure it is to pick up the "plain as an old shoe" New Republic, which is not beautiful nor was meant to be, but is wise.

I suppose I feel about the New Republic in a personal sort of way. Today with the McCarthys looking for Communists under every bed and fanatics screaming their prejudices at the top of their voices, a poor middle-ground liberal who is neither a Communist nor a Fascist is a pretty lonely soul. He feels like imitating my pet kitten by crawling into a brown paper bag to get away from it all.

I am sometimes in such a mood when the postman brings me my New Republic. I hide the breakfast dishes in the oven and glance through the magazine to pick out articles to be enjoyed as a reward for housework dutifully, if reluctantly, completed. As I read, visions of some of my favorite people come to me. "My sister in Alabama will say 'Amen' to this one," I'll say to myself. "My friend in California will object to this, but she'll read it; she reads everything, bless her heart—and I hope it does her good." "And this one is just the thing for my college professor friend who always conceals a copy of the New Republic in the Commencement program to counteract the effect of the baccalaureate address." The thought of these and of other readers, whom I do not know but am sure I would like, is reassuring. Un-Pollyanna-ish though it is, the New Republic has done me good. No longer do I feel like the "I" in the Housman poem, "a stranger and afraid, in a world I never made." I have become a human being resolved to do something about it. . . .

If you are a subscriber, renew.
If not a subscriber, order now.

Regular Order Form

THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49 Street • New York 17, N. Y.

For the enclosed $6.50 please enter an annual subscription in my name. (Foreign or Canadian postage $1.00 extra.)

NAME .....

STREET .....

CITY .....

ZONE.....STATE.....11/13/50

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Republic

CONTENTS FOR NOV. 13, 1950

5 Shaw's World—And Ours
An Editorial

6 The Assassination Attempt
An Editorial

6 The Week:

6 Franco Wins

7 Testing the McCarran Act

7 How Much Steel?

7 System With A Future

8 Denham's Feud

8 McCarthy in Maryland

8 Philippine Facts of Life

9 Outside America

10 Can Free India Survive?
By Michael Straight

14 How Strong Is Russia's Economy?
By Karl Scholz

17 Harold L. Ickes

18 Books:
Shirer's "Berlin Diary"
Novel
Reviewed by Robert St. John

19 "Horace Greeley . . ."
Reviewed by Richard Hofstadter

19 The Truman Merry-Go-Round
Reviewed by Alexander Uhl

20 Theatre

22 On the Air

EDITOR: Michael Straight

EDITORIAL DIRECTOR: Bruce Bliven

PUBLISHER: Daniel Mebane

ASSOCIATE EDITOR: Helen Fuller

ASSISTANT EDITOR: Elizabeth Huling

REPORTER: Jean Begeman

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS: Malcolm Cowley, John Farrelly, Harold L. Ickes, Joseph P. Lash, Max Lerner, James R. Newman, Gus Tyler

DEPARTMENTS: Robert Hatch (Chief), Cecil Smith (Music), Saul Carson (Radio and Television), Harold Clurman (Theatre), Lincoln Kirstein (Fine Arts)

COPY EDITOR: Marjorie Stanley

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1950, IN THE U. S. A. BY EDITORIAL PUBLICATIONS, INC., PUBLISHING OFFICE 301 N ST., N. E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C. EDITORIAL AND BUSINESS COMMUNICATIONS SHOULD BE ADDRESSED TO 40 EAST 49 ST., NEW YORK 17, N. Y. ENTERED AS SECOND-CLASS MATTER SEPTEMBER 26, 1950, AT THE POST OFFICE AT WASHINGTON, D. C., UNDER THE ACT OF MARCH 3, 1879. SINGLE COPY, 20¢; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, $6.50; CANADA AND FOREIGN, $7.50. PRINTED IN THE U. S. A.

WASHINGTON WIRE

NOTES WHILE AWAITING election returns: It is the dearest dogma of public relations experts that Americans must be coddled and cosseted like toy spaniels; radio, movies and television all base their treacly appeal on the 14-year-old mind and, in this ignoble election, politicians have generally followed suit. Times cry for austerity and sacrifice; the whirring sphere teeters above World War III. Yet the full-bellied candidates baby-kiss and out-promise each other like soap manufacturers urging that theirs is the patented double-action soft-and-easy way to scrub out the world's grit and blood without dishwashers' hands. Oh, for some candidate to stand up and say, "The times are dark and dangerous. Follow me and I will lead you, friends, into toil and sweat and higher taxes, for these things are essential to forestall something worse!" Would the voters respond? We are persuaded that they ache for such a grim and honest call, for the time demands greatness, and the public knows already in its heart that these *things are true.*

The new lame-duck session of Congress meeting shortly has one specific task: to vote more taxes to curb inflation. Prospect is, however, that it will vote additional war appropriations, postpone taxes. Many Congressmen frankly believe the public prefers to have its money taken by inflation than by taxes.

There are $34.5 billions of E-bonds now outstanding with large-scale redemptions just around the corner. The E-bond purchaser of November, 1940 today receives on redemption a purchasing value of only $58 plus 2.9 percent interest, bringing the total to $77. Treasury eagerness to sell new bonds is equalled only by desire of thrifty Americans for some really inflation-proof bond to buy. But so far the bold American ingenuity that invented the A-bomb hasn't devised a safe E-bond.

No election predictions this week for this column. We predicted enough for two elections in 1948. We note a similar coyness in contemporaries. But we feel that certain far-reaching portents appeared even before the votes were cast. To enumerate: whether Taft wins or loses in Ohio, or Dewey in New York, we can't for the life of us see either man picked as GOP Presidential candidate in 1952. The Hanley letter queered Dewey for keeps on the national stage, and, as for Taft, 100 percent of organized labor is against him, and what party would buy a candidate with that incubus?

Next conclusion drawn from the campaign is the desperate GOP need for Eisenhower. The GOP needs a Name. The party has faced five straight Presidential defeats and is not going to do too well, we guess, in this test (there we go predicting!). It has on its back the terrible burden of Wherry, Capehart, Jenner, Cain, McCarthy and the Chicago *Tribune.* These cave-dwellers would rather lose an election than change an idea, but the younger, modern group—such as Ives, Lodge, Aiken, Morse, Tobey, Flanders and Mrs. Smith of Maine—is sick and tired. The party could unite factions under Ike. He is a glamor-puss. Best of all, nobody quite knows where he stands. These are invincible attractions.

Something deep and fundamental happened in Ohio even before the votes were counted. The AFL-CIO rift has largely healed. Organized labor has moved one step further in its slow political maturity. The lessons learned in Ohio are probably more important in the long run than the outcome of the Taft-Ferguson battle. Labor is in politics and has made implacable enemies. In Ohio it found that it is not enough to wait for the campaign: it must assert itself earlier and demand a say in the candidate it will support.

Reporters never watched Truman so

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

carefully as after the crazy attempt on his life by the Puerto Rican assassins. Had it made any change in him? Universally the verdict was that he was calm and unmoved as he spoke at Arlington cemetery in dedication of the monument to Sir John Dill immediately after the tragedy. We noted only one tell-tale sign, something we never saw Our Harry do before. Just before time for him to speak we observed him quietly paste his gum on the table in front. Significant? —Decide for yourself.

Notes: Campaign comments we shall treasure: Alistair Cook's observation that Taft has a face "as guileless as a grapefruit," and Stewart Alsop's summary of the miraculous occupational adaptation of Senator Donnell (R, Mo.): "He remembers not only the names of the voters but the names of the voters' cows". . . . Olympic irony note: Red China threatens to plunge us into World War III, yet lacking UN representation or direct diplomatic contact we don't really know what she wants or is fighting for. . . . Note that Senator Byrd (D, Va.) publicly spoke for Taft before election. . . . Ablest surgical journal in the world, admired as much in US as UK, is the *Lancet* of London; it now publicly and formally disavows AMA charge that the National Health Service is making British hospitals less efficient. . . . There are signs that the school in Washington which thinks finger-shaking can curb galloping inflation is less confident; even Stuart Symington last week started to talk tough. . . . The more realistic school including the copy-reader's nightmare, M. S. Szymczak of the Federal Reserve Board, has urged stronger action from start. . . . Congratulations to Harvard Professor Howard Mumford Jones who, with other distinguished scholars, has rejected summer teaching job at red-baiting University of California. . . . Acheson has no intention of quitting or Truman of firing him, "inside" stories to the contrary notwithstanding. . . . On the other hand, ill-health may cause Marshall to yield post to Robert Lovett. . . . Final pre-election note: there were less than 2,000,000 unemployed as 1950 voters went to polls.

Washington T. R. B.

CORRESPONDENCE

The Japanese Constitution

SIR: In general, you are to be commended for your excellent editorial on "The Challenge of a Japanese Treaty" (*NR*. October 16). I feel, however, that you have missed a very vital point in regard to the new Japanese Constitution.

The problem of the new Constitution is not only a question of how much it can be weakened by undemocratic forces but it is also a question of how much support Japanese liberals can give to this Constitution which may embody their general beliefs but seems, in every way, the obvious product of a foreign power. Can Japanese liberals defend this document, written without consultation with them, which has, nevertheless, been proclaimed as their handiwork, and which is enforced by an alien state? . . . The history of liberal Japan is a history of the surrender of democratic ideals to an overpowering patriotism and even more extreme forms of nationalism.

That the new Constitution is not a product of the Japanese mind has been observed in this country. Harold S. Quigley wrote in the *American Political Science Review* of October, 1947:

> Obviously, no Japanese conceived or wrote the lines quoted in the new preamble. They were composed while the old constitution was in force and would have been arrant lese majesté under it. But today they are part of Japan's supreme law which all Japanese, in or out of public office, are bound to respect and uphold. It is possible that the majority of the people do not know what they mean and that an influential element accepted them only under duress and will seek to dilute them by interpretation. . . . Assuming that these new liberal forces do emerge, will they feel the handicap, will they resent the implications of a constitution imported from alien conquerors?

Mark Gayn in his book, *Japan Diary* (William Sloane Associates, Inc., New York, 1948), said:

> One night . . . key officers in General MacArthur's Government Section were told in extreme confidence that they would have to draft a new constitution for Japan. . . . Originally, it was intended to draft the new constitution in 10 days. General Whitney had expressed his hope that it could be announced by the Japanese on February 22—George Washington's birthday. . . . What is wrong—disastrously wrong—is that this Constitution does not come from the Japanese grass roots. It is an alien Constitution foisted on the Japanese Government and represented as a native product; . . . any high school student simply by reading it can perceive its foreign origin.

While I was in Japan last year, I found that the Japanese are quite aware of this situation and although prohibited by censorship from discussing such matters publicly, in private conversations intellectuals of all shades of political thought are quick to point out the "non-Japaneseness" of the *Shinkempo* (new Constitution). . . .

Moreover, the contemplated repeal of the new Constitution's most popular section, the controversial Article IX which renounces the right to maintain military forces and the right to wage war as an instrument of government policy, will alienate more of the new Constitution's supporters and will weaken what little strength it may have. (I am discussing here the effect of rearmament upon the Constitution, not whether rearmament is desirable or not.)

What we in America must face is this: can we afford to put our faith in this weak and faltering structure or should we look to other, perhaps more indigenous, solutions? This question should be a part of the challenge you offer.

JOSEPH L. ANDERSON
Antioch College, Yellow Springs, Ohio

"Losing the War of the World"

SIR: Will you give me space to state two propositions that I do not think the *New Republic* can ignore? First, the two great Communist powers will never accept an unfriendly government in Korea. Our task of reconstruction in that peninsula on democratic lines is therefore futile. Second, the long-range policy of the USSR is the destruction of our capitalistic economy. By our own full-scale war measures, dictated by a mixture of arrogance and fear, we are destroying it ourselves. Can it be doubted that while we have won the battle of Korea we are losing the war of the world?

It is true that in the system of the USSR there are stresses and strains that may cause a collapse. I note a special article, however, in the *Minnesota Star* [syndicated by the New York *Times*. – Ed.] by Harrison E. Salisbury, which asserts that there is no hoarding in Moscow and that prices have not risen above those of March; that neither government nor people give signs of preoccupation with war or preparation for it. In spite of comment by the editor, loyally seeking to minimize the conclusions of their correspondent, Mr. Salisbury's article seems convincing.

Chicago, Ill. ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

A Correction

An error in editing resulted in garbling a sentence in Harold Ickes' column last week. The late Henry L. Stimson was, of course, US District Attorney before, and not after, the First World War. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

TESTING THE McCARRAN ACT

When the McCarran Communist-control bill passed Congress, opponents warned that it would take years before there would be any official roster of Communists or Communist organizations. The expense of litigation and the burden on the law enforcement and immigration staffs of the Government, already overworked, would be immeasurable. Warnings of confusion and chaos have proved valid.

Today, six weeks after the McCarran bill became law, there is not a single name on the Department of Justice's register. Communists and Communist organizations, as had been predicted, simply ignored the provisions of the new law. The immigration procedures in American ports and US consulates around the world were so disrupted by the new barriers that Attorney General J. Howard McGrath sent a letter to Secretary of State Acheson last week to explain why some of the provisions must be temporarily relaxed. Two federal court judges took action against the interpretation that the new Act permits the Attorney General to jail suspected Communists without hearings.

Since the Department of Justice opened its nation-wide deportation drive against alien Communist propagandists, 29 of the 86 scheduled for arrest and shipment abroad have been taken into custody. Last week, Federal District Judge William J. Campbell released on habeas corpus petitions three men seized as alleged Communists. The three already were under bond in deportation proceedings that began in 1947, and Judge Campbell said that arresting them while they were under bond was an abuse of the discretionary power given the Attorney General. Because of his "judicial role," Judge Campbell said he could not deny the men hearing and bail. Another Federal District Court Judge, Walter J. La Buy, in Chicago, ordered release of two other aliens awaiting deportation hearings, on the ground that the Attorney General's order was "arbitrary and capricious." Judge La Buy said there was no evidence that the two aliens' freedom on bond would menace the security of our Government.

In Los Angeles, however, US Judge Ben Harrison indicated, during a hearing on petitions of four other aliens, that he would refuse to free persons held without bail under the new law unless each one "can take the witness stand here and say that he is not a member of the Communist Party. . . ."

HOW MUCH STEEL?

The struggle to get more steel to keep American production booming is threatening to burn up some plush executive offices in both Washington and Pittsburgh. The old story of persuading the reluctant steel monopolists to boost output heavily is varied this time by the fact that steel-maker Ben Fairless and associates have some influential sympathizers in the Administration while expansion-minded Government production officials have found some potent allies in private industry.

The big question is how quickly our present 100-million-ton steel production can be expanded to meet a demand which is soon expected to call for around 130 million tons a year. Stuart Symington, chairman of the National Security Resources Board and Assistant Secretary of the Interior C. Girard Davidson are asking that the 130-million figure be met within two or three years. Industry spokesmen have announced through their friend, Commerce Secretary Charles Sawyer, that they are getting ready to raise output by ten million tons in a period variously reported as two, three and ten years. The steelmen's resistance to radical expansion is based on their traditional policy of keeping control of the market by maintaining the supply of the metal at a level always slightly short of demand.

Secretary Sawyer, whose Commerce Department includes the new National Production Authority, has been vigorously defending the steel industry and attacking his more energetic fellow officials. In a recent New York speech to the Veterans of Foreign Wars, he assailed those inside and outside the Government who don't appreciate the difficulties involved in expanding steel capacity. At the same time, Charles E. Wilson, president of General Motors, has been publicly scolding the steel industry for not having enough confidence in the country to expand production sufficiently. He has demanded that "steel executives should get the dust out of their eyes and go ahead with the rest of us." Automobile makers' worries that defense needs will seriously limit their steel supply have been echoed by Edgar F. Kaiser of Kaiser-Frazer, who charges that the steel industry has neglected to fulfill its obligations to steel users.

The "steel-as-usual" spokesmen have fallen back on the old cliches in trying to stem the widespread demand for expansion action. Edward L. Ryerson, chairman of the board of Inland Steel, claims that attempts are under way to "socialize the industry," with Government mill operation as a start. "The steel industry is now in a fight that will come to other industries unless we win," Ryerson says. The actual situation is that the Government has not yet made any plans at all for steel-plant building, as it has done for aluminum; has never even mentioned steel-plant operation; and is generally making very timid use of the powers to increase industrial capacity given it by the Defense Production Act.

Whether or not the fight will really get hot depends on whether the steelmen see the light. Should industry spokesmen refuse to come closer to what production officials think are the country's minimum needs, drastic action can be expected from Washington. If Symington is forced to enter publicly into the controversy he will come up against the fact that his "co-ordination" powers do not permit him to overrule Sawyer. Then it will be up to the President to choose between them.

SYSTEM WITH A FUTURE

Early reports on campaign contributions this year show the supposedly solid South giving heavily to the Republicans, and Republican New England writing checks for the Democrats.

During the first eight months of 1950, the Republican National Committee outcollected the Democrats in gifts of $100 or more in North Carolina, South Caro-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lina, Tennessee and Texas—$41,875 to $28,125. However, the Democrats received more than twice the amount the Republicans collected in Maine, Connecticut, New Hampshire and Rhode Island. Maybe the two-party system has a future.

DENHAM'S FEUD

Robert M. Denham, recently dismissed as General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, is carrying his case to the McCarthy-stripe Republicans. After a round of attacks on the NLRB before employers' audiences around the country, Denham recently denounced his former agency as harboring Communists and entered the final days of the Missouri Senatorial campaign on behalf of Sen. Forrest Donnell, who wants to bring railway labor, now exempt, under the Taft-Hartley law.

The ex-Counsel made his "Communist" charges before a luncheon meeting of the American Veterans Committee, basing them on "reliable reports," founded on "loyalty program investigations." Denham, who has been with the Board since 1937, said that there were "undoubtedly" some Communists or fellow travelers among the 700 of the present personnel who are holdovers from the early days of the Wagner Act administration.

Denham's charge against all the NLRB personnel seemed to make no sense at all. He had personally ruled over almost all the agency's operations for three years; the new General Counsel, George J. Bott, had been picked as an assistant by Denham himself; and four of the five members of the NLRB's loyalty board had also been appointed by him.

Denham's complex personality bedeviled NLRB operations since 1947, when he took over the powerful job as General Counsel, created by the Taft-Hartley law. From the start he conducted a personal campaign to cut down what he believed to be the dangerously large powers of labor. He harangued employers to prosecute under the new law, ignored the five-man Board in initiating his own persecutions of unions, and all but destroyed the NLRB's function as an agent for industrial peace.

When President Truman finally relieved Denham of his responsibilities in September, the rift between him and the Board had come to the point where Denham refused even to file the Board's briefs in court. His leaving had the effect of clearing the air with a minimum of dislocation, for not a single NLRB staff member felt strongly enough to leave with him. Relations between the two sides of the agency got back to normal. General Counsel Bott agreed with the Board on policy on the main issues; Chairman Paul Herzog and the other members now exercise their power of approval on the appointment of regional officers; the Counsel represents the Board in all cases, and the jurisdiction of the NLRB is made effective by limiting it to enterprises with more than 250 employees, whereas Denham had previously insisted on pursuing the unions no matter how small the units.

One sign of returning stability and concern with labor relations in the NLRB was that nobody bothered to reply to the charges made by the former Counsel, who intends to resume private law practice when his political engagements permit.

HERBLOCK IN THE WASHINGTON POST

"We Haven't Been Idle Either"

McCARTHY IN MARYLAND

Joe McCarthy and Fulton Lewis Jr. have concentrated on defeating Sen. Millard Tydings (D) in Maryland. Lewis, a Maryland voter, tediously harangued his listeners with anti-Tydings diatribes for almost two solid weeks. McCarthy keynoted the final week of the campaign with a radio speech that sank low, even for him.

Secretary Acheson, McCarthy told a rally for the Republican candidate John Butler, "is the procurer of the pinks and punks in the State Department." The Administration, he said, is a "Commiecrat Party." He predicted that if the GOP is returned to control of Congress "you will see the greatest exodus from Washington of that motley crimson clique that this nation has or ever will see. . . .

"Each of the last three Democrat Presidents has had his war," McCarthy said. "The only wars fought in the last 50 years were under Democrat Presidents. Each Democrat President with his own war has taken a tremendous toll in the lives of our young men."

PHILIPPINE FACTS OF LIFE

The controversial Bell Report, which seems to have aroused some heart-burning in Manila, is far more a lesson in the simple facts of life for the United States than it is for the Philippines. For it does two things: First, it paints a picture of a class-dominated society in the Philippines strikingly similar in its selfishness and greed to that of many of the world's trouble spots, and second, it intimates that the basic laws that now regulate economic relations between the United States and the Philippines may not be perfect.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Bell Commission, in restrained yet unmistakable language, gives us a brutally realistic view of the pattern of society in the Archipelago. It recommends that the Philippine tax structure "be revised to increase the proportion of taxes collected from high incomes and large property holdings," noting that under the present tax system only about 15 percent of the government's revenues is derived from income and profits taxes while the remaining 85 percent "comes mainly from excise and sales taxes and other forms of revenue that give little weight to ability to pay as a criterion for collecting taxes."

The Report speaks, too, of the injustices of the Philippine system of land tenure where land ownership has tended to go into larger and larger holdings with the opportunity becoming less and less for the tenant farmer to acquire his own land. "The Philippine farmer is between two grindstones," the Report says. "On top is the landlord, who often exacts an unjust share of the crop in spite of ineffective legal restrictions to the contrary. Beneath is the deplorably low productivity of the land he works. The farmer cannot see any avenue of escape."

The Report also tells of the bad balance of Philippine industry and agriculture, the result of which is a crushing import program of food and goods which the Philippines should produce themselves. Unfortunately the United States must bear some share of responsibility for this, since it continued the Spanish colonial commercial pattern during American possession of the Islands and further encouraged the status of the Philippines as a raw materials producer in postwar legislation.

The picture of the Philippines that the Bell Report gives, highlighted by an imposing collection of statistical facts, is that the rich are getting richer and the poor, poorer. In this picture corruption, of course, is an important element, athough the Bell Report very rightly does not make it the all-pervading element. Corruption is frequently overdone as a cause of national decay, lulling people into the easy belief that if only they will "turn the rascals out" everything will be fine. The crucial fact is that more frequently poverty and misery spring from a pattern of life that is completely legal in itself, yet is filled with pitiless selfishness on the part of those accustomed to hold political and economic power. The unwillingness of the Filipino industrialist or land owner to tax himself or to make the slightest sacrifice for the welfare of the community lies at the root of the matter. It is on that level that change must come —not merely the easy solution of throwing a few vulgar thieves into jail.

The Bell Report is part of a series of documents which indicate that slowly but surely American officials are beginning to recognize the true nature of the problems with which they are faced in many countries of the world. In Greece we have had the blunt announcement from Marshall Plan officials that aid will be curtailed unless the Greek Government carries out tax reforms of the same type needed in the Philippines. We have had the beginning of a similar attitude in Italy, where again the lack of a just tax system and land reform have become a scandal.

OUTSIDE AMERICA

There are many Europeans who want preventive war, who hope for it, pray for it, even work as well as they can to get it started. This is an ugly, horrible fact which must be faced.

Large numbers of men who are nonetheless European for the fact of existing beyond the Elbe, the Vistula, the Bug, the Danube have come by now to accept, indeed to welcome, the practical political implications of the old German proverb, *lieber eine ende mit schrecken als eine schrecken ohne ende*—better an end with horror than a horror without end. No one in the West can tell just how many Poles, Hungarians, Czechs, Rumanians, Ukrainians, refugees in Germany, even Russians feel this way.

Francois Mauriac — France's great Catholic writer, conservative, passionate enemy of Communism—writes in the Paris *Figaro:*

> It is unbelievable yet true that certain European peoples are so unhappy that war has become their last hope. To the degree that the black thunder-laden cloud rises and spreads, they feel like men condemned to death whose supreme chance for escape is the earthquake which will smash the stones of their prison. . . . Even after the annihilation of all parties except Stalin's, even after so many deportations and hangings, every report from Poland or Rumania, from Budapest or Prague, proves that there are people who would prefer to risk the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah if that were the price of their liberation.

Mauriac has only recently been converted from neutralism to support for collective security. His plea now is against a neutrality of the spirit, against a callous disregard of the humane in the calculations of the great of the earth. He wants President Truman and the United Nations to come out boldly and clearly with a declaration of preventive peace aims that will give those who now hope for war a reason and a chance to hope for a liberating peace.

Mauriac is one of the many Western Europeans in all countries and of all political parties (except the Communist) whose doubt about America, its policies, intentions and possible courses of action, was greatly lessened by the events in Korea. But among this many, there were some on the non-Communist Left whose trust in America, briefly stimulated when America was losing in Korea, practically disappeared as soon as America started winning. To such men—Claude Bourdet of the Paris *Observateur* is an example—the Korean events might never have taken place for all the difference it makes in the renewed die-hard anti-Americanism. Collective security is to them nothing more than an American imperialist trick.

To the presumably progressive London *New Statesman and Nation* Mauriac's proposal must seem absurdly visionary, for the reforms of the UN proposed by Dean Acheson in order to make it—and others like it—possible are castigated as wicked invitations to preventive war. It writes:

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To arrange for the Assembly to have the Security Council's right of action will seem to many people a sign that America has given up the hope of peace. America would always be in a position to mobilize *her numerous satellites all over the world* against action *described* as Communist aggression. . . . Provoked, *it may be said,* by Moscow, America proposes herself *to dominate the world* by rearming in Germany those very groups which made the last war, by making a peace with Japan which will give a completely free hand to the old Japanese war lords and by reorganizing the UN so that in all circumstances American policy will be supported and Soviet policy rejected. [Italics mine. – P. W.]

Such ill-considered overstatement, bordering on the absurd, can easily be interpreted as a retrospective judgment on Korea: the aggression was only "described" as such; it "may" be said, but isn't fact, there was provocation; Britain, France and the nations of the Commonwealth were all American "satellites."

The distortion through prejudice of the intelligent judgment of a once-important Western European intellectual elite is scarcely less ugly in its implications than the surrender through desperation of the will to live in peace of masses of men in Eastern Europe. Taken together the two facts add up to more trouble for that growing majority of Western European liberals (with a small "l") who understood the great need to differentiate at this historical moment between reasonable, just criticism of America and blind, unreasoning condemnation. They combine to make for a defeatism far worse than the variety which has been decreasing since Korea.

It is no secret in Paris and London that some fire blazes behind the thick smoke of Soviet accusations, that some "operators" of the West are busily organizing secret underground armies in the satellite countries—armies of a Western Kamikaze mystique. Nor is it any secret that this kind of "democratic" Fifth-Columnism in the East helps Soviet Fifth-Columnism in the West. The domestic security measures taken in countries like Italy, France, Belgium against the Soviet Fifth Columns inevitably assume an anti-democratic character. Democracy, especially the American kind, is equally inevitably blamed; and an element of a new defeatism about the chances of an honestly democratic preventive peace is formed.

The opposite of the preventive-war thesis—the credo of peace at any price—is too unpopular politically in the fall of 1950 even for Bourdet and Kingsley Martin of the *New Statesman and Nation.* So it has been transformed into the doctrine of any kind of peace provided that America pays alone, by herself, the full price, including that of suffering the effects of an intellectual Fifth-Columnism carried out by envenomed minorities on the Left in her "satellites." The effect on the authentic liberals is to hamper their efforts to mobilize opinion behind the preventive collective security of the UN, for the thesis that "America proposes to dominate the world" is such a gross and grotesque exaggeration that it discredits the whole Left and creates an element of defeatism that plays directly into the hands of the "operators" on the Right who want preventive war, hope for it and work for it.

PERCY WINNER

CAN FREE INDIA SURVIVE?

by Michael Straight

JAWAHARLAL NEHRU, Prime Minister of India, opened the Institute of Pacific Relations Conference in Lucknow by charting an independent course for all Asia to follow.

That night in Lucknow an aged woman was dragged from her hut and eaten by a wolf.

The ironic contrast of these two events seemed inescapable. For the wolf, though driven by hunger, could hardly have been hungrier than its victim. Many sights —the swollen bellies of children, the blood coughed up on the streets, the crowds sleeping uneasily on the pavements at night, the women trailing cattle to scoop up the last handful of dung—testified to the rift between the ambitions of India's leader and her present state.

Nehru is British in upbringing, and the state he leads is created in Britain's image. Its judiciary is independent. Its army is subordinate to civil power. Its constitution is essentially democratic. Its press within limits is free. Sometime next year 170 million citizens, the world's largest free electorate, will go to the polls in one of Asia's first general elections. Eleven in every twelve voters are unable to read or write. They will place marks against pictures of birds, trees, tractors, the symbols chosen by the candidates.

What is important is not whether India is or is not a democracy, but that she is setting out on the road to democracy.

How far will she travel down that road? In India, today, population is rising rapidly, production is stagnant, living standards are falling, disillusionment is spreading, even before the first election, as the Government fails to keep pace with its tasks.

These developments, and not the speeches of Indians on the faults of the United States, must be our primary concern.

The population of India is rising by three and a half million each year. To maintain existing living standards India must produce 400,000 tons more foodstuffs each year, and obtain a 12-percent rise in production during each decade. Those tasks are not easy in a land already overpopulated. The most grandiose projects of

This is the first of a series on nationalism, Communism and democracy in India and the Far East. – THE EDITORS.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the state to raise production can hardly match the increase in output that the population rise alone requires.

The women of the villages, with their children swarming around them, may be ready for instruction in birth control. The Government is not ready. The long-range solution is to make children economically unprofitable by prohibiting child labor, making education compulsory, and placing on parents the cost of school books. But even primary schools are a long way off for the villages.

In contrast to India's rising population, industrial production, which increased 20 percent during the war, has fallen back close to 1939 levels. Productivity in basic industries is well below prewar levels. Agricultural output, which rose six percent above 1936-39 levels in 1943, is now below the levels of those years.

The wholesale price index has risen fourfold since 1939. It stands now at 413 and is rising at the rate of 1.4 percent a month. Inflation has redistributed income in favor of the peasants and reduced the burden of rural debt. But it has led to intolerable hardships and costly strikes in the cities. Americans might absorb a 20-percent cut in living standards without injury to their health. But for Indians, who work a lifetime to accumulate two earthen pots, a few yards of cotton for clothing and a rope bed, there are no margins. Three million died of starvation in the famine of 1943.

Inflation is ruining India's tiny and all important middle class. The doctor who serves ten thousand citizens, the teacher struggling with a newly-started school, the soldier and policeman who maintain order and essential services, the technicians and clerks who keep the railways moving, the civil servants whose integrity is the mainstay of democratic government: all these groups are exhausting their savings and cannot see ahead. They are the men and women who may save India from going the way of China. And it is worth remembering that there were groups in China with the same standards in 1927, who were destroyed by mounting inflation.

The Government is determined to do what it can to save India. Its first task is to free itself from its own illusions.

Forty years of political agitation persuaded Indians that their poverty was caused by British rule. The demand for independence was partly a demand for economic development, fired by the belief that independence would usher in the age of plenty.

In the exuberant days of 1947 the new Government produced the Bombay Plan, providing for a 130-percent increase in agricultural output and a fivefold expansion of industry within five years. Since then plans have slowly been brought down to practicability.

In agriculture, the Government knows now that it must first avert famine this year, that it must next check the food deficit caused by rising population, and that it must work to raise nutritional standards some time during the next 10 to 20 years.

The Government has set out to reclaim six million acres of land; to irrigate another three million acres, and to increase the infinitesimal use of chemical fertilizer. It is moving ahead with hydroelectric projects that will mean another four million tons of food a year. Meanwhile the provincial legislatures are enacting legislation authorizing villages to purchase land with payments of eight to 12 years' rent, from the Zemindari who have owned the villages and have ruled them with feudal powers.

Yet the peasants lack the funds to buy out the Zemindari, and where they find funds, the shortage of land will leave many more landless laborers than peasant proprietors. Land reform in itself tends to diminish rather than increase agricultural production. Rising prices lower production still farther as farmers achieve traditional standards with less effort. Partition and the trade war with Pakistan have deprived India of close to a million tons of grain a year from the Sind, Punjab and East Bengal. The land itself is drying up. It needs tube wells for irrigation, but tube wells require electricity. It needs chemical fertilizer, but that means fertilizer plants. There are no funds within India to finance large-scale capital investment in the land. Yet a flight over the country demonstrates how indefinable are the limits between the colorless desert and the pale green fields where crops struggle in the dry heat between the monsoons.

South India has endured three years without rain. In North India, floods have destroyed crops and warehouses in six provinces. In a land that knows only parched heat and brief weeks of heavy rain, less than a third of the land has an assured water supply.

Mechanization of agriculture has been seen as one great hope. But mechanization is checked by the break-up of farm units, and the limitation of farm holdings by legislation in order to create work for millions of surplus farmers. Mechanization is further checked by the absence of trained personnel. As in Nationalist China, the Government has been impatient with on-the-job-training programs. Farm machinery companies in turn have played for short-run profits in pushing sales ahead of service centers. Today every city has its graveyard of ruined tractors and wasted farm machines. For these reasons India's goal of self-sufficiency in foodstuffs is still over the horizon. Thirty-five percent of her imports from the US and Canada are foodstuffs at a time when her future turns on her capacity to import capital equip-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ment. Self-sufficiency in foodstuffs may be no alternative to industrialization and international trade. Yet a nation which keeps 70 percent of its people on the land and is unable to feed itself can never progress.

The answer lies in the villages where traditional Hinduism perpetuates an acceptance of caste, of poverty, of superstition and corruption. Until the villages become ambitious for higher living standards, for education, and for the responsibilities of democracy, productivity will not rise.

I visited one village where 800 Indians live off 60 acres of sandy, irrigated soil. It had been adopted for educational work by the Indian Village Service, a missionary project of the Methodist Church.

A voluntary teacher was seated in a circle of laughing children as we walked in between the mud walls. She held up a drawing of a pot over a fire. "We boil the water before we drink it," the children shouted. Next a picture of corpses lying in a row. "We kill the mosquitoes before they kill us!" chanted the children. A man with a stick, "We must not chase the blind man away!" Later the children brought out flat bits of wood blacked with charcoal. They drew painstaking letters with bamboo sticks dipped in chalk and water.

The smallest children had lines of charcoal drawn around their eyes to keep demons away. When school ended they rushed off to purify their houses by spreading wet cow dung over the floors. Yet in school there were Brahmins and Untouchables, brought together after weeks of argument. More weeks had brought a concentration of livestock in one square, a competition for the cleanest house, a movable latrine. Next would come tactful suggestions on the heartbreaking primitiveness with which the villagers draw their water and till their fields.

The villagers were eager to learn. The teacher had been invited to the next village a mile away; she went and found the women sitting patiently with blackened boards and bamboo pens in their hands.

Yet what can one church mission accomplish among 700,000 villages? The universities might help. But too often the professors are pursuing the common linguistic origins of Homeric and Hindustani legends while the students debate imperialism and the 38th Parallel. In rural India, "the government" is largely a myth.

India's industrial future is equally uncertain. Capacity is wholly inadequate, and Indian industry is running at two-thirds of existing capacity today.

In prewar years, the industrialists were the financiers of the independence movement. In turn the nation rallied behind them in buying home-made products and boycotting British goods. The identification of conservatism with imperialism abroad led the independence leaders toward an alignment with Socialist groups overseas. But Socialism was not a predominant faith in the independence movement.

In wartime, however, prices were forced up by speculation hoarding and black market profiteering. Private enterprise was discredited. The momentum of independence carried India toward an indeterminate Socialist program.

India in 1947 lacked two essentials of Socialism: trained personnel, and a taxable source of savings to be applied to investment in nationalized industries.

The Civil Service was trained to administer law and collect revenues, not to develop resources and manage industries. It was cut in half by Britain's withdrawal from India, and the tasks assumed by Government were already beyond its skills. Taxes were barely able to meet existing expenditures of Government, and the shift in national income to the villages made it much harder for the Government to levy on national savings.

At the same time India lacked a vigorous capitalist class. A small group of industrialists are expansionists in outlook; a large class of merchants, like moneylenders, lack accepted business ethics. Between the two extremes is a type of businessman to whom the idea of low rates of profit on a large turnover is unknown. He may shut down his factory if current accounts show a loss. He may close his engineering plant if he is offered an attractive price on the black market for his allotted quota of imported steel. He may clear his investment on new equipment in four years and ruin it in five, instead of running it through the 30-year span for which it is built. He may raise prices at every opportunity instead of seeking an established market for his product. Inflation has reinforced his concentration on cornering scarce goods for a price rise, rather than on creating new wealth.

Over the next 20 years, a new generation of young and expansionist bankers and industrialists may arise in India. Their emergence is delayed by the uncertainties of government policy and the climate of public opinion, which is hostile to private enterprise and individual wealth. Still more serious are restrictive loyalties to group, locality, religion and caste. Despite rapid progress towards equality, a man is born into a caste in most of India, he marries within his caste, works and lives within it, and is buried in a caste graveyard. Every profession, and each sector of banking, trading and manufacturing may be reserved for a particular caste. Ability becomes a minor qualification in management; mobility of labor and skill is greatly restricted. Nationalization becomes one way in which non-favored castes can enter industrial management. And caste, by forbidding wide

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

practical experience, perpetuates the theoretical bias that dominates Government and university circles.

The new Government of India chose to compromise between Socialism and private enterprise. It carried through legislation to provide arbitration, job tenure, profit-sharing and cost-of-living bonuses in private concerns. It extended government regulation to all important industries and reserved new undertakings in basic industries for government ownership. It asserted its right to acquire any basic industry at any time. It granted the private sector of industry a ten-year period of grace before deciding on nationalization. Foreign and domestic investors laid down the conditions under which they could function; the Government replied that this was an intolerable intrusion on its newly-won sovereignty.

Two thirds of new investment in industry has been financed by Government. Its ambitious plans for irrigation and river valley development have been carried largely by deficit spending and the liquidation of overseas balances built up during the war. Today inflation is forcing a halt in deficit spending, the overseas balances are running out, and nation building services are crippled further by expenditures on armaments which take more than half of India's budget without producing an armed force that can help the UN. For these reasons public investment is crippled while private investment is stagnant.

Private investment has been difficult, given the uncertainty of communal tensions, the trade war with Pakistan, the instabilities caused by refugees, and the absence of basic social facilities for workers in industrial centers like Bombay, where a million workers are today without any housing. The Government's threats of nationalization have certainly contributed further to India's industrial stagnation without providing for any Government plants. "Fair" rates of profit, set by the Government, may correspond to standards recognized by the London School of Economics. Yet they have little bearing in a nation where prices have been rising 20 percent a year. In the light of the small compensation set for the Zemindari, businessmen have felt with reason that they have no incentive to expand capacity or even to replace existing capacity.

The people of India, exploited for centuries, have been fully justified in demanding that the political revolution of 1947 should be followed by social reform. Yet, as in many nations, social reform may conflict with short-term economic progress. In India labor productivity has fallen 40 percent below wartime peaks and is 30 percent below prewar levels today. One-half of this decline is due to a shortage of raw materials, and a return to one-shift production. The rest is due to legislation and labor's own attitudes. The labor force rose more than 50 percent in wartime, from 1,700,000 to 2,600,000. Labor and the Government undertook to hold it at peak levels when production declined in postwar years. By Government action, no competent worker can be fired today without a hearing before a Government tribunal, and an award. In addition to a normal let-down after the efforts of wartime, labor has a human tendency to take advantage of the existence of the tribunals by slowing down.

This padding of the labor force keeps prices and costs up without greatly discouraging new investment. In contrast, the payment of cost-of-living allowances, which are higher than wages in many factories, reduces the effectiveness of piece rates and cuts down labor's incentive to work.

A major reason given by Indian industrialists for their present paralysis is the restriction imposed by domestic and import controls. In 1948, certainly, the textile industry was greatly damaged by Government regulation. This year, textile manufacturers were forbidden to buy US cotton when it was available; now, when the Government seeks to buy it there is none left. The Government is not fully able to manage a controlled economy. Yet Indians resist the abolition of haphazard restrictions, remembering the disastrous price increases that followed the premature lifting of controls after the war.

Low productivity causes inflation. In turn, inflation has destroyed India's present capacity to save and so to invest in new productive capacity. Before the war a group of one million Indians, each of whom set aside $700 a year, maintained a rate of saving equal to 10 percent of India's national income. Now the group is living on past savings to make both ends meet. India's present rate of saving is three percent of national income and cannot finance a significant increase in industrial capacity.

So India's farsighted leaders turn abroad, hoping that the West will come to India's aid.

So far, the West has not responded. One half of the foreign holdings in India were sold when the British withdrew. Since 1948, British firms have invested only $12 million in new enterprises in India. Established firms like our own Standard Oil have maintained and added to their equipment. In new enterprises the US and Hong Kong investors as a group have each staked $20,000 apiece in India's future.

The US Government has not been very helpful to India. Indians, inhibited by fear and pride, have been kicked back and forth between the World Bank and the Export-Import Bank with little to show for their pains. A year's negotiations for a transfer of wheat fell through

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

when a weary Administration in Washington decided that Congress would vote no more foreign aid. Since then bitterness has grown on both sides.

If no aid is given, living standards will decline in India. Since independence and democracy are identified with rising incomes, what will happen if living standards continue to fall?

In any Western country the answer might be clear. In Asia, the traveler begins by analyzing economic factors because other factors are still more obscure. But he learns to recognize their limits. In addition, a people who have known nothing but misery have a certain patience and tenacity that Americans cannot easily grasp.

Yet we have brought a vision of a better life to Asia, and today we are working to a timetable forced on us by Chinese and Soviet revolutions that press on regardless of human costs.

For a generation, any one of these factors may hold India to her venture in democracy:

The experience of rising standards of living.

The evidence of economic progress.

The belief that the Government is on the side of the people.

In the next 10 years the first of these factors may be impossible to achieve, even with large-scale aid. The second and third we can help to bring about. Beyond one generation it is hard to believe that stagnation is compatible with a society based on voluntary initiative, education and consent. Already the necessity of compulsion is talked of more and more and the question is raised whether, for Asia, there can be a half-way house between a free society and a police state. Either India is likely to turn off the democratic road, down bypaths that lead to oligarchy and theocracy; or she may pull up stakes and set out on the Moscow road, to industrialize her economy by indoctrination, sacrifice and terror, without regard for the cost in human life. That is a natural course in the sense that in Asia the individual counts for very little today.

What is true in India is certainly true in Burma, Ceylon, Indonesia and Pakistan. And if democracy fails in India, where will the line hold, east of Calcutta and west of Bombay? Indians who are not afraid to ask these questions know that the answers lie within their people. Yet, since there is little time left, they wonder how far Americans, politically impatient and economically hard-pressed, are willing to help a continent that is at best determined to find its own way to its own form of democracy.

New Delhi, India

RUSSIA'S ECONOMIC STRENGTH TODAY

by Karl Scholz

AMERICAN journalists are fond of writing articles comparing conditions in the Soviet Union and the United States. Sometimes these come out heavily in favor of one country, sometimes of the other. Many of them however share a common defect: they translate rubles into dollars at an arbitrary rate, usually 25 cents to the ruble. This gives us such fantastic, unrealistic items as reports of men's suits in the USSR at $277.25, men's shoes at $85 a pair, and the like. Before Korea, we also used to get comparisons between Russia and American military expenditures which showed that Russia was spending twice as much—or according to other figures, more than three times as much—as ourselves.

For the dubious quality of such statistics, the Russians themselves are partly to blame. Official production statistics in various basic branches of the Soviet economy are published regularly by the Central Statistical Administration of the Council of Ministers of the USSR. But the data are almost invariably presented either in terms of a percentage of change from an earlier period or a percentage of fulfillment of the annual production plan. Only rarely are official figures given of actual physical volume of output. This method of statistical presentation of productive achievement may be in accordance with dynamic socialist theory, which views economic activity in terms of continued growth, rather than in terms of absolute data. On the other hand, it may be deliberately designed to make it almost impossible for one without access to basic data to obtain an insight into the actual status of Soviet output, which would indicate the strength of the Soviet economy.

Only laboriously is it possible for a foreign investigator to arrive at an estimate of actual production results in various basic branches of the Soviet economy. These estimates may then be checked against intermittent authoritative statements appearing in Soviet publications, which occasionally do indicate actual production accomplishment in a particular year. For example, the gross grain harvest returns in the Soviet Union in 1949

Karl Scholz, professor of Economics at the Wharton School of Finance and Commerce, University of Pennsylvania, holds M.A. and Ph.D. degrees from that institution. He has for many years devoted much of his time and attention to a study of economic conditions in Russia, and visited the country several times for that purpose. He is co-author with Dr. S. Howard Patterson of "Economic Problems of Modern Life," and has written several other books on economic subjects and many magazine articles.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

were said to have been above the prewar 1940 level and almost equal to the target set by the Five-Year Plan for 1950. In 1940, according to official statistics, the grain harvest amounted to 119 million metric tons, while the 1950 plan calls for 127 million tons. But the official figure of grain output for 1949 was 124.6 million metric tons, which was, as officially stated, above the 1940 level and close to the planned output for 1950.

A recent study of Postwar Economic Reconstruction and Development in the USSR, by Abram Bergson, James Horton Blackman and Alexander Erlich, represents a scholarly attempt to arrive at estimates of production in a number of selected Soviet industries during the postwar years, down to and including 1948. These estimates are based on a careful interpretation of official Russian data regarding percentual changes in physical volume of output in various branches of the Soviet economy, related to such basic Russian source data as can be discovered.

The 1949 percentual changes over 1948 for a number of fields of economic activity, as set forth in the Statement of the Central Statistical Administration, were applied to these 1948 data, to obtain an estimate of physical volume of output for various branches of the Soviet economy. These estimates were checked against as yet unpublished independent estimates of Russian output in postwar years through 1949, made by the Department of Commerce. With one exception, the Department of Commerce data did not deviate by more than two or three percent from the estimates based on the Bergson study. This exception pertained to estimates of actual output of coal in the Soviet Union in 1949. More recent pronouncements made by Soviet spokesmen would seem to suggest that the Bergson estimates were too conservative.

But absolute figures of physical output in any given year give little indication of the relative strength of a national economy at a particular period of time. These data must be related to corresponding production data in another economy in order to obtain some idea of the comparative economic strength of the two. Such a comparison is made for the USSR and the US, for a selected group of industries, in the following tabulation. In making this comparison for 1949, it should be borne in mind that the territory of the Soviet Union is nearly three times that of continental United States, with a population upward of 200 million, compared with a population in the United States only about three-fourths as large. Moreover, while there were around 35 million industrial workers and office employees in the Soviet Union in

COMPARATIVE PRODUCTION DATA IN SELECTED FIELDS OF ECONOMIC ACTIVITIES, 1949[1]

Items	*Units*	*USSR*	*US*	*USSR as % of US*
Est. Population	Million	203	148.5	136.6
Ind. Workers and Office Employees	"	34.8	43.	80.9
Area	Mill. Sq. Mi.	8.47	2.98	284.2
Coal Output	Mill. Met. Tons	235.9	428.0	55.1
Petroleum (Crude Oil)	" " "	33.4	368.2	9.1
Pig Iron	" " "	17.1	49.3	34.7
Steel Ingots, Castings	" " "	21.3	71.2	29.9
Cement	" " "	8.4	35.2	23.8
Elec. Power	Bill. Kw. Hrs.	74.8	344.6	21.7
Tractors	Thous.	83.1	458.6	18.3
Trucks and Autos	"	307.8	6,288.1	4.9
Copper	Thous. Met. Tons	233	719	32.4
Paper	" " "	1,027	18,450	5.5
Cotton Cloth	Mill. Meters	3,682	7,740	47.8
Woolen Cloth	" "	150	346.5	46.2
Leather Shoes and Slippers	Mill. pairs	163.8	456.9	35.8
Butter	Thous. Met. Tons	291	639.	45.5
Grains, Gross Output	Mill. Met. Tons	124.6	142.0	87.7

[1] The above comparative analysis was made by a number of students in the course, "The Soviet Economy," given in the Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania. Their co-operation in this study is gratefully acknowledged.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

1949, approximately 43 million were thus employed in the United States. These figures on employment should be borne in mind when observing the overall production achievement in various basic fields of production. A more meaningful comparison might be made if the number employed in 1949 in each branch of industry in the two economies were compared with the physical volume of output, but such data are not currently available. The comparative tabulation appears on page 15.

The basic production statistics for the United States are taken from such official sources as the *Survey of Current Business* and 1949 *Crop Production Statistics* (Bureau of Agricultural Economics). For comparative purposes, physical output was converted to metric units, as employed in the Soviet Union. Crude oil production in the United States is ordinarily reported in barrel units. These were converted to metric tons at the ratio of 5.5 barrels (430 pounds each) per metric ton. Short tons of metal production were converted to metric tons by considering a metric ton as equal to 1.1 short tons.

Comparison of physical units of output, such as tractors, trucks and automobiles, must be viewed with decided reservations. Such a comparison allows neither for varying horsepower per unit, nor for possible difference in quality of product, a factor which cannot be overemphasized. For example, the linear measure of cotton and woolen cloth gives no indication of either the width of the cloth, the texture of the fabric, or the variety of patterns. Admittedly models and patterns in Soviet production have often been simplified in order to achieve a specified quantity of output.

Comparisons between gross production of grain in the Soviet Union and the United States in 1949 may be accepted only with decided qualifications. Since 1933 official crop production statistics in the Soviet Union have been based on the so-called "biological yield," rather than the actually harvested or "barn" yield. This change was said to have been necessitated because the Russian peasants were hoarding grain. While an allowance of around 10 percent is made for harvesting loss in estimating the gross crop yield on a biological-yield basis, in the prewar period agricultural experts in the United States estimated harvesting losses at upward of 20 percent of biological crop yield. (These losses tend to vary, not only with efficiency in harvesting and the use of mechanical aids, but also with weather conditions at harvest time.) Qualified observers maintain that the current reports of gross crop yields on a biological basis, as published in the Soviet Union, may contain an overstatement of actual harvestings by as much as 10 percent.

Russia is still very largely an agrarian economy, in spite of the emphasis on industrialization under the several Five-Year Plans; in 1949 she produced about four-fifths as much grain as did the United States.

Production of petroleum, iron and steel, products often referred to as the sinews of modern warfare, in 1949 lagged far behind the same items in the United States. The production of such consumers' goods as cotton and woolen cloth and leather shoes was less than half that of the United States.

Although Lenin propounded the magic formula "electrification plus Sovietism equals Communism," comparative data indicate that the United States is much better off as to electrification than is the Soviet Union. In the production of motor vehicles, Russia still appears to be in her infancy in comparison with the United States. All in all, the comparative estimates of production in various basic fields of economic activity support the belief that Russia's real national income in 1949 *was not much more than one-third as large as that of the United States.*

Even admitting the possibility of a liberal margin of error in the estimates, relative economic weakness rather than strength is indicated for the present-day Soviet economy. That economic progress has been made in the Soviet Union since the inception of the first Five-Year Plan, and particularly since 1946, is not denied. But as already suggested, the percentual data of accomplishment published from time to time by the Soviet government are rather deceptive, and may easily lead to erroneous conclusions. Only as these percentages can be applied to a given base do they attain any practical significance. When this is done, the inferiority of Soviet production in various branches of basic industry is rather apparent. One reason for the Iron Curtain may be to conceal this weakness as far as possible from the outside world.

The foregoing data as to the relative strength of the Soviet economy and the economy of the United States, based on an interpretation of official statistics, would scarcely seem to warrant widespread fear of Russian military might, which in the last analysis is dependent on economic resources. Before Korea, Soviet Russia seemed to spend a larger percentage of her national income for military purposes than did the United States; but such percentages have little significance unless related to the real income of the country. It can scarcely be doubted that Soviet Russia, with its much smaller real national income than that of the United States, is feeling the burden of armaments far more than is the United States. What to the people of the United States may be an expensive luxury, may be a heavy sacrifice to the people of the Soviet Union. The frequent pleas to curb the armaments race, emanating from the Soviet Union, may be prompted more by economic than by purely humanitarian considerations.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

HAROLD L. ICKES: *Election Aftermath*

THIS IS being written while the heterodox campaign in New York is approaching its climax. Even if the result could be predicted with any degree of certainty, it would be fruitless to venture a guess, because the result will have been known by the time that this appears in print. This will be an attempt to look beyond the election.

The shifting and counter-shifting that have been taking place seem likely to emerge as a kaleidoscopic reassortment of political forces in the Empire State. Whether this will happen or not, it is a fact that realignments during the campaign have taken place at an accelerated rate. I doubt if any one could have predicted, at the beginning, the confusion that has developed as a result of startling and unexpected incidents.

The principal explosive factor in the New York campaign, of course, was the Hanley letter which was an expression of overcharged emotions rather than the product of a cold and calculating intellect. From this letter, it appeared that Governor Dewey had offered Hanley, in the event of his defeat by Senator Lehman, a state job carrying a substantial salary. Moreover, some person or persons undertook to pay Hanley's considerable debts which had been hanging over him for some 20 years. In his letter, Hanley bemoaned pressures which, to him, seemed to justify his acceptance of a price for his withdrawal as a candidate for the Republican nomination for Governor in favor of Governor Dewey who had voluntarily renounced the nomination only a few months earlier.

To any fair-minded person, it was apparent that Hanley had been caught in a nutcracker which was ruthlessly employed to destroy his will. He surrendered on the terms of his tormentors. This was just how "voluntary" the renunciation was. The operation also disclosed to what extremes Dewey and his coadjutors, consisting of members of the Dewey "team" and mighty Wall Street financiers, were willing to go to force their will upon an old man who was deeply in debt and dependent upon an assured income for the support of himself and his family. This was to be made up by a salary from an easy state job, plus resources, the nature or origin of which has not been disclosed.

Some one, whose identity it would not be too difficult to guess, saw to it that this extraordinary letter reached the hands of interested Democrats who might be depended upon to use it to Dewey's disadvantage. The Governor finally managed in some way to get hold of a copy of the document which has proved to be so damaging to his reputation and prestige. It showed him to be what in fact he always has been—a ruthless procurer of political advantage for himself. Fearing that the Democrats would make the letter public at any hour, Dewey required Hanley to give it out. Desperately put to it to contrive something that would soften the blow that would follow, and without regard to its possible bad effect upon General Eisenhower, Dewey made a wild clutch at the Eisenhower coattails.

Dewey loudly proclaimed that in no circumstances "that he could then foresee," would he be a candidate for President in 1952. This had a familiar sound. Dewey was for Eisenhower for President and he would do all that he could to bring about the General's nomination. If he were re-elected, Governor Dewey could be a very potent factor in nominating the popular Eisenhower. Of course, in the meantime, some situation "unforeseeable" at the moment of the phony "renunciation" might arise as a result of which Dewey would be able to wriggle out of his qualified commitment and again lead his party to another defeat.

A suspicion that Dewey, while pretending to be supporting Corsi for Mayor, was promoting the cause of Impellitteri, both by secret aid and by open words of praise, became a practical certainty toward the close of the campaign. James A. Farley appeared as one of the brewers of this political devil's broth. He had gone early to Europe, as he did when Senator Lehman was running in 1949, but before departing, he had done what he could to line up his friends for Impellitteri, although, as usual, loudly proclaiming himself to be a "Democrat." Upon his return, this pretended "regular" refused to speak for Pecora. Indirectly, he has been the source of sizable campaign contributions to Impellitteri.

Thus, it would appear that Dewey and Farley were striking hands, although under cover, in support of Impellitteri. Dewey's less honorable intentions were clear. He wanted a broken field in which to touch the governorship for the third time behind the goalposts. Farley's purpose was also apparent. An Impellitteri victory might give him the chance that he has been looking for to take over control of what would be left of a discredited Tammany and become the principal Democratic figure in the teeming area that constitutes Greater New York. As almost declared political allies, the team of Dewey and Farley presents a strange combination to the voters of New York.

HAROLD L. ICKES

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

WILLIAM SHIRER'S "BERLIN DIARY" NOVEL

by Robert St. John

WILLIAM L. SHIRER has written the most sordid and repugnant book this reviewer has ever read. Through its 374 pages slithers the scum of human society: thick-lipped prostitutes with leering faces; pimply-faced homosexuals; brutal Storm Troopers; a Vassar girl who employs sex to torture her victim; an unprincipled American oil man so ignorant he doesn't know that Trotsky is dead; a simpering Washington diplomat who holds his job because his family makes automobiles in Detroit; and dozens of other unpalatable characters. By the time the reader reaches page 93 he will put the book down temporarily and come up for a breath of air.

THE TRAITOR, by William L. Shirer (Farrar, Straus; $3).

But all this is no criticism of Shirer, for he is writing about Germany between Munich and V-E Day, and it is obvious that he wishes to convey to his readers the same revulsion he himself felt as he lived through that period. The story is not new; a great many foreign correspondents tried to tell it at the time. Shirer himself told it well in *Berlin Diary*. But it bears repeating, and in novel form it has a powerful impact, especially at this particular moment in history when so many of us have forgotten so much that happened so recently.

Against the *Berlin Diary* background Shirer has created a character who will be long remembered; an American newspaperman whose frustrations finally find their outlet in Berlin, where he becomes a broadcaster for the Nazis and sinks to their moral level. Shirer takes a scalpel to the boy's mind and soul, doing a splendid job of tracing the mental gyrations of a traitor. One is reminded a little of that classic of the war, *Address Unknown*.

Many of Shirer's characters are fictional, although anyone who lived and worked in Europe during the war years will recognize faces he once knew. But others are real, a circumstance that will turn a few American faces red and cause the book to be violently denounced in some quarters. Hitler, Goering, Goebbels, Keitel, Raeder, von Brauchitsch and Rommel are all in the book. So also are General Marshall, Lindbergh, Wheeler, Nye, Taft, Hoover, Father Coughlin, Hamilton Fish and General Wood.

Shirer reprints General Marshall's off-the-record warning to newspaper and radio men that the Red Army could not hold out six weeks against the Nazis. He quotes Herbert Hoover's statement a few days before Pearl Harbor that war with either Germany or Japan was improbable, and Senator Taft's claim that it was "fantastic to suppose there was any danger of an attack on the United States by Japan." He makes frequent mention of Charles Lindbergh, recounting his decoration by the Nazi Government, several of his anti-Semitic speeches, and nearly a page from a statement alleging that the European conflict was not between right and wrong, but "between differing concepts of right." Shirer shows how the Nazis used the stands taken by all these prominent Americans.

He also has harsh words about New York editors and radio executives who fire their foreign experts at whim. One of the most sardonic character sketches is of the great New York news commentator "G.D.," who pontificated from Radio City each evening over America's largest network.

Of American radio, which Shirer should know well, he says:

> Here was a medium which might have brought to the great mass of people much they were hungry for in music, in drama, in comedy, in information and education, being exploited . . . by a handful of mediocre, selfish, greedy men [who] had scant interest in building up this magic invention to purvey the best in entertainment and art and education and news. Though the air waves did not belong to them but to the people, they saw in radio merely a fabulous means of snatching a quick dollar.

He bemoans the fact that books in America are read principally by women, while their husbands occupy themselves with the comics, and the sports and financial pages. "The men of America," he has one of his characters say, "had given up even the pretense of trying to be informed, cultivated human beings. . . . They kidded themselves that such things were sissyish and therefore better left to the weaker sex. Could it be that men stopped growing up in America, so that outside of their work they remained, in mind and spirit, always in their teens?" Those are samples enough of the way Shirer writes; the importance of the book lies elsewhere.

Halfway through the war one of Goebbels' assistants advises the American traitor how to poison American public opinion in his broadcasts. He says America must be won over by getting her to join Hitler's "holy crusade against Bolshevism," and he predicts it will not be difficult:

> The business men who, after all, run the country, and the church people, especially the Catholics, will fall for it. So, on Bolshevism, Oliver, the sky's the limit! Cry Reds! Communist terror! Atheism! Loss of property! Quote the Pope! Quote Bill Bullitt! Quote 'em all!

The scheme, of course, fails to work, but the Nazi line never changes. At the end, when German Generals and Admirals are surrendering, they follow the line Hitler set down for them, on the theory that Germany's defeat would be only temporary if they could but sow the seeds of World War III among the victorious allies.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

One of the cold strategists on Hitler's staff makes this statement:

As soon as Germany surrenders, Russia and America, the only two powers left in the world, will be at each other's throats. They will immediately start fighting for the mastery of the world. In this struggle, which I consider inevitable, lies Germany's hope and opportunity. This time we can scarcely fail to win the peace . . . by throwing our support either to Russia or America, whichever offers us the first opportunity. . . . When the proper time comes we are going to try the Americans first—them and the British.

It is well that Shirer's publishers have brought out his novel at this time, when so many of the Nazi leaders who engineered the cremations and other atrocities are being released from prison, and when some American Generals, hoping the public has forgotten, are campaigning for the rearming of Germany to help fight the war Hitler planned for us. This book will disturb you, but you *must* read it!

Robert St. John, foreign correspondent, writer and news commentator, is the author of "The Land of Silent People."

THE FEVERED MARCH

HORACE GREELEY: VOICE OF THE PEOPLE, by William Harlan Hale (Harper; $4).

"I SHALL NEVER comprehend Greeley," declared one of his associates, "for I can never discern the personal considerations which sway and govern him." In spite of Greeley's obvious importance and his rich symptomatic significance for nineteenth-century America, biographers have on the whole shirked the difficult job of comprehending the man; his story has long been one of the big gaps in our biographical literature. William Harlan Hale's study is not "definitive," as his publishers claim, but it is an excellent full-length portrait, certainly the best since the gossipy job done by James Parton in 1855.

Although hardly a great man, Greeley was a great editor, a great crank, and through his weekly edition of the New York *Tribune*, one of the towering influences on national opinion. This influence was probably exercised because of his irregularities, and it may well be that his most important function in the American psychic economy was to give play to the native love of mavericks and maverick ideas. He became—quite self-consciously, one imagines—a salesman of his own eccentricity, an entertainer in journalism, as Hale aptly remarks, who combined the functions of the moralist and the showman. He began like hundreds of ambitious boys who came to the cities from nineteenth-century farms, went to work as printers, and established themselves as editors on the foundation of modest amounts of self-acquired educational and financial capital.

For all that Greeley was regularly associated in practical politics with the parties of privilege, he was a man of personal generosity, broad human sympathies and an experimental utopian turn of mind. While working for the Whig Party, he flirted with Fourierism. He was also anti-slavery and pro-temperance. He believed in vegetarianism, and when he was at home lived with his incredible wife on vegetables, Graham bread and unseasoned puddings. One shudders to think of what he might have done in the world had he been a meat-eater—but then he would not have been Greeley, for it was the essence of him to be a herbivorous creature in a carnivorous world.

In politics Greeley began as a mercenary and ended as a martyr. His early survival as a journalistic promoter was dependent upon his services to the Whig machine of Thurlow Weed and William H. Seward in their battle with Jacksonian democracy. But the *Tribune's* success made him a national oracle; he grew independent, broke with Weed and Seward, and in 1860 got revenge for their cavalier treatment of him by contributing to Lincoln's victory over Seward at the Republican convention. Constitutionally unstable, he remained something of a thorn in Lincoln's side as he threw his support alternately to contradictory policies, exercising his bad political judgment in full national view much as a famous athlete flexes his muscles for the crowd.

What was most touching about Greeley was the contrast between the impor-

What have we done?
What are we doing?
What will we do?

20TH CENTURY UNLIMITED

Edited by BRUCE BLIVEN

Standing at the half-way point in our century, sixteen experts look at where we've been, where we are, and where we are going. The view is stimulating and encouraging. Bruce Bliven, editorial director of the New Republic, besides editing the book, has contributed a clear-eyed and clear-minded introduction. You can judge the high quality of the rest of the volume by the following list of contributors and their subjects.

What Hope for World Government?
By ELMER DAVIS
Science and Civilization
By LEON SVIRSKY
The Advance of Medicine
By MARGUERITE CLARK
Food and the Future
By GEORGE R. COWGILL
Problems of Population
By WARREN S. THOMPSON
American Politics in Transition
By HOWARD J. McMURRAY
American Business Today and Tomorrow
By ROBERT S. NATHAN
The Future of Trade Unionism
By PHILIP MURRAY
Education Takes Stock
By WILLIAM H. KILPATRICK
American Art
By CECIL SMITH
How the Writer Lives
By MALCOLM COWLEY
The People Amuse Themselves
By HAROLD CLURMAN
The Future of Our Cities
By ROBERT B. MITCHELL
Mid-Century Manners and Morals
By CLYDE KLUCKHOHN

At all bookstores $3.50

J. B. LIPPINCOTT COMPANY
Philadelphia • New York

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tant public figure and the helpless and innocent private man. To the incredulous amazement of serious observers of politics, he captured the Presidential nomination at the insurgent Liberal Republican convention of 1872, which by default made him Grant's opponent in the national election. As an editor he had survived both his advanced principles and his ingratiating inconsistencies, but in the arena of practical politics he was bound to be handled roughly by the professionals, who soon made him wonder whether he was "running for the Presidency or the penitentiary." His wife, whose mental illness had always deprived him of domestic repose, died during the campaign and Greeley's own tenuous balance was overthrown by the combination of death and defeat. "My life," he once said, "has been a fevered march." It flickered out, at the end, in a pathetic flurry of melancholic self-denunciation.

RICHARD HOFSTADTER

Richard Hofstadter, associate professor of History at Columbia University, is author of "The American Political Tradition."

★ ★

Is psychoanalysis an enemy of religion —or an ally?

psychoanalysis and religion

A major new work by ERICH FROMM

Pointing the way toward spiritual peace for those who cannot accept dogmatic religion, a noted psychoanalyst takes the position that psychoanalysis is a means for the realization of the human values underlying all great religious teachings.

At your bookseller, $2.50

YALE UNIVERSITY PRESS
New Haven 7, Connecticut

★ ★

THE CARNIVAL REVISITED

THE TRUMAN MERRY-GO-ROUND, by Robert S. Allen and William V. Shannon (Viking; $3.50).

IN ALL the great mush of what passes for Washington political reporting, there are perhaps half a dozen reporters who look with clear and courageous eyes on the men who make our lives. Robert S. Allen is one of them. In *The Truman Merry-Go-Round*, he and William V. Shannon, a fine reporter in his own right, have collaborated on a frequently bitter, always biting, analysis of our national "statesmen." It is not a particularly well-written book; its judgments are sometimes sacrificed to the pleasure of a well-turned, cruelly contemptuous phrase. But standards of elegance and good taste do not really apply in this case; *Merry-Go-Round* is admirable for its acuteness and its willingness to withstand the timid conformism that has emasculated so many of our watchmen.

Allen and his collaborator have approached Washington politics in the spirit of old-fashioned liberalism, and they make no bones about it. They judge men by standards of service to the community; and their judgment is well-nigh infallible. Except for the book's praise of Louis Johnson in his fight against the "brass," there does not appear to be a single opinion with which dispassionate observers of the Administration, the Supreme Court, the Senate or the House could disagree.

Allen's reputation for having a caustic tongue is again justified by this book. The more finicky may shrink from such terms as "bush-league lawyer" for Homer Ferguson; "hatchet men of the real estate lobby" for Cain and Bricker; men "who think with their larnyx" for Karl Mundt; "He would serve his country best by returning to private life," for Attorney General McGrath. But the more robust, understanding why *The Truman Merry-Go-Round* says these things, will applaud.

Yet it would be wrong to think that Allen and Shannon have nothing but contempt for politics and politicians. Few writers grow as lyrical in the presence of a man to be admired and respected. Few tributes could be as touching as the one they pay to Edward P. Costigan of Colorado, or to the women in our public life, notably Helen Gahagan Douglas.

The chapter on the book's chief protagonist, Harry Truman, is disappointing. At moments Allen and Shannon see him as a man who has grown into a kind of greatness; at others they dismiss him as a bleak mediocrity with a penchant for other mediocrities. If this contradiction is really in the man, the authors still do nothing to resolve it.

It would be easy but inaccurate to say that the book attempts to succeed by shock. Rather, it looks with anger and honest concern at the frantic struggle for power and wealth that marks so much of American national life. *The Truman Merry-Go-Round* is a fighting indictment of the shoddy and anemic reporting that floods out of Washington each day. It is a welcome political purgative.

ALEXANDER H. UHL

Alexander H. Uhl, former Foreign Editor of the newspaper "PM," spent many years in Europe as correspondent for the Associated Press.

THEATRE

A Little On Shaw[1]

THERE IS SOMETHING in the current theatre-in-the-round production of "Arms and the Man" which brings out its "Chocolate Soldier" quality in a most agreeable way—although, to be fine about it, the taste of the production tends more toward the blandness of vanilla. The quaintness of the play, which is partly due to its age (1894), the roguishness generally characteristic of Shaw, and his always disarming mixture of bonhomie with shrewdness are highlighted by the toy dimensions and party informality of the Arena Theatre.

Almost every critic who writes about Shaw (and who hasn't?) emphasizes either the philosopher or the artist, but very few have been able to fuse the two

[1] Mr. Clurman's article was written before the death of GBS, on November 2. – THE EDITORS

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

aspects into a perception of the whole man. The fact that the critic must have some scope of sensibility and intellect to deal with Shaw completely is perhaps what makes him the outstanding literary personality of the twentieth-century theatre.

This is not the place to undertake a critical summation of Shaw's contribution either to the theatre or to thought. I wish merely to point out a curious contradiction in the criticism of Shaw: when his ideas fail to irritate any of our sore spots, many of us speak worshipfully of his philosophical penetration; when his ideas do manage to hit home, even more of us are eager to pay tribute to his art; but where his art and thought have the least direct bearing on our immediate social situation, there you will find the critics evincing the utmost intellectual awe.

The best of "Arms and the Man" is its delightful third act, a most exhilarating form of mental vaudeville, a composite of sparkling rhetoric with theatre tricks as old and gay as the art of comedy—all based on intellectual hypotheses that are now acceptable without being hackneyed. This is Shaw's intelligent man's guide to bright entertainment and common sense.

"Mrs. Warren's Profession" (1893) is less characteristically Shavian in its tone, but more essentially Shavian in its social conviction. It is fascinating to observe—even through the crude production at the Bleecker Street Playhouse—how the early Shaw tried to refurbish certain conventions of the late Victorian theatrical and moral tradition by giving them a dry-cleaning of quasi-Marxian realism and his own genial brand of Puritanism and laughter.

The play, by turn charmingly and embarrassingly rickety, still retains a revolutionary core which is lacking in the more accomplished and smiling "Arms and the Man" (mostly confined to the simple spoofing of a now obsolete romanticization of the military). If it is true, as some maintain, that Shaw is eminent chiefly by virtue of his message, "Mrs. Warren's Profession" is the more important play—although its importance will be ducked by those to whom any form of anti-capitalism is abhorrent. If Shaw's manner is what we most esteem, then "Arms and the Man" may be regarded as his first success in the art of making Dutch-uncle preachment both funny and cute.

I managed to enjoy "The Curious Savage" despite my belief that even the best play wrongly done is a bad play. John Patrick's "Curious Savage," which will undoubtedly fare better in the hands of future amateur and collegiate producers, reveals a talent for an affectionately daft humor. What it suggests in a delicately playful fashion is how nearly impossible it is for good people to live within rational dimensions when the norm of reasonable behavior is stuffy and vulgarly prosaic. On the other hand, the director Peter Glenville's "Curious Savage" is stagey where it should be poetic, stylized in the most pedestrian manner where it should be fanciful and relaxed. All the actors (including Lillian Gish) struck me as rigid with direction. Mr. Patrick's lovable lunatics are turned into puppets without personality. The atmosphere of the home in which his characters carry on their enchanted existence, and which might conceivably be designed in Robert Edmond Jones style as a kind of pearly dreamland of their fantasy, is rendered as an asylum with an expensive and properly institutional look that would drive any sensitive person crazy.

I was able to take Lonsdale's inconsequential "The Day After Tomorrow" without flinching, because though the author brought nothing fresh to his subject—the bankrupt English aristocracy—some actors (Melville Cooper, Eva Leonard-Bayne) amused me, as does everything that reflects even faintly the British way of facing the music.

HAROLD CLURMAN

William L. Shirer's first novel

Why does a man betray his country?

Oliver Knight was a decent man, a man born of mediocrity and driven by dreams of power and wealth. Oliver Knight could be any man, seduced by promises of glory and greatness. His story is one that might have been true, that eloquently portrays the conflicts of our time. $3.00

THE TRAITOR

FARRAR, STRAUS

ff

A new novel by the author of LAST OF THE CONQUERORS

Is a woman ever "born evil"?

This is the angry, yet tender story of a man who pitted his love for a woman against her own despair—and had to fight the persistent evil of life in a Philadelphia slum. $3.00

by WILLIAM GARDNER SMITH

ANGER AT INNOCENCE

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESORT

OPEN FOR THANKSGIVING

(Nov. 22nd thru 26th)

Full Sports Program; Entertainment Staff including Square Dance Caller.

Early Reservations Advised

Chesters' ZUNBARG

Woodbourne, N. Y. Phone: Woodbourne 1150

BOOKS

ATHEIST BOOKS, 32-page catalogue free. Truth Seeker Co., 38 Park Row, N. Y. C. 8.

HANDWRITING ANALYSIS

SCIENTIFIC HANDWRITING analysis, Alfred Kanfer, 62 Leroy St., N. Y. C. Tel. WA 4-1575. Cooperating with doctors, psychologists, schools, firms, industries. Lessons. By appointment, or mail. Marital, educational, vocational, psychological problems. Fee $5.00.

LANGUAGES

LINGUAPHONE MAKES LANGUAGES EASY. At home learn to speak Spanish, Portuguese, Italian, French, German, Russian, by quick, easy Linguaphone Conversational method. Save time, work, money. Send for FREE book. Linguaphone Institute, 85S, Radio City, New York.

ALL LANGUAGES BY RECORDS. ALL MAKES. Sold, bought; rented inexpensively. **Alin, 475 Fifth Avenue, New York, Mu 3-1093.**

LITERARY SERVICE

WRITERS—Efficient sales service for your books, short stories, articles, plays. Free booklet. Write today! Daniel S. Mead Literary Agency, 419 Fourth Ave., New York 16, N. Y.

PECANS

WE ARE NOW HARVESTING jumbo, delicious, thin-shelled PECANS; ideal for gifts. Will ship prepaid (Cont. U.S.) 5 lbs. $3.25, 10 lbs. $5.50, 100 lbs. or more, F.O.B. 42¢ per lb. FABIS FARM, Brownwood, Texas.

APARTMENT WANTED

VETERAN and expectant mother, desperately need 3-4 rooms. $65. Manhattan. Will cooperate. WA 9-6831.

New Republic

CLASSROOM RATES

10 cents a copy in lots of 10 or more shipped to one address

DESK COPIES FREE

ON THE AIR: Color Controversy

IN SOME story situations and in some settings, color movies are an improvement on pictures in black and white. But the movies are a branch of the theatre, part of a world of illusion, and color on the screen is intended to make the illusion more powerful, not (except, perhaps, in the case of documentaries) to make the picture more real. Television, on the other hand, is largely a documentary world. To be sure, it presents plays—it even presents movies—but the real lure of the TV screen is that it offers you life "in person." In television, therefore, color is not just something added; it is altogether new.

Frieda B. Hennock, of the Federal Communications Commission, has seen more color television than most of us. She witnessed demonstrations put on for the FCC by CBS, by RCA and by the third of the polychrome contenders, Color Television, Inc. (CTI). She describes it as follows:

> Until you have seen it, you will not be able to grasp fully how significant a development this [color television] really is. It will bring pictorial splendor right into your home. . . . It really adds a new dimension to television, and it is impossible to express in quantitative terms the amount of additional intelligence which it can convey.

I am not the only one who agrees with Miss Hennock. Her view is accepted by the entire industry. The only argument is on engineering standards. The FCC can, and does, prescribe these standards in the field of broadcasting, but it has no power over the manufacturers who make and sell the receivers through which the broadcasts are seen. The FCC has made a decision. It has ruled that CBS's engineering standards can bring us color television of the kind we should see. So far, the manufacturers, led by RCA and by the Radio-Television Manufacturers Association (RTMA), seem determined to stymie the FCC, to stay away from the rainbow.

Just what has the FCC decided after long, complicated hearings and demonstrations? Part of the official ruling says:

> The quality of the color picture which the CTI system produces is not at all satisfactory.
>
> The color fidelity of the RCA system is not satisfactory.
>
> The CBS system produces a color system that is most satisfactory from the point of view of texture, color fidelity and contrast.

You don't see the FCC's comparisons of picture fidelity mentioned in the advertisements being financed by the $1 million tossed into the pot by RCA and its friends in the RTMA. What you do read a great deal about is something called "compatibility."

The CBS system is not "compatible." By itself, your present set is useless for CBS color video. With an *adapter*, it could pick up those signals in black and white; with an *adapter* and a *converter* it could receive them in color. The RCA system is also "incompatible," but not as seriously so as CBS's. Your present set by itself could pick up an RCA colorcast in monochrome; it would need only a converter to get the full effect. But, according to the FCC, the full effect in this case is not much good.

To buy the adapter and the converter for the CBS system, you might have to spend about $135. To buy the RCA converter alone, you'd have to pay about $175. In either case, you'd have "compatibility." But either system can be built into new television sets. There are now between seven and eight million TV sets in operation. The saturation point will be reached at a figure between 40 and 80 million receivers. The Commission asked the manufacturers to devise methods for building the new type of TV reception into all future sets, saying:

> If sets continued to be manufactured at the present rate of production . . . then one year after the adoption of an incompatible system, approximately 40 percent of the receivers in the hands of the public should be capable of receiving these signals without any changes whatsoever—they will have been built that way.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Commission noted that "some manufacturers expressed a reluctance to build sets for an incompatible system." That put the situation mildly. The manufacturers—the big ones—are on strike. Why? I found the answer in Professor W. Rupert Maclaurin's *Invention and Innovation in the Radio Industry*. In 1940, RCA was "pushing aggressively" for permission to start commercial television broadcasting: "The Radio Corporation of America had done most of the research and, together with Farnsworth, controlled the basic patents." RCA, therefore, wanted TV to go ahead, while other companies asked for postponements because they had "more to gain by delay."

The shoe is now on the other foot. CBS has spent $4.5 million developing color television to its present stage, but the new transmitting equipment and, more important, the new receivers, would have to be made by RCA and its fellow manufacturers in the RTMA. Clearly—since there are still somewhere between 30 and 70 million black-and-white receivers to sell—they have "more to gain by delay." Today we buy a regular set; tomorrow we buy a "super-compatible" set.

CBS, of course, is also eager for the profit to be made potentially from wide acceptance of the standards now adopted by the FCC. It is willing to let any manufacturer use its basic patents for a royalty ranging from 25 cents for sets selling under $100 (there aren't any such in TV now) to $1 for receivers selling for $100 or more. That would bring a very neat return on the initial investment in color. But the important fact is that CBS has satisfactory color ready for broadcast and reception *now*. RCA was hot under its corporate collar for commercial TV in black-and-white in 1941—and had its way. The FCC says, "The CBS color system is at least as fully developed as was the black-and-white system in 1941."

The "compatibility" issue—since no one has achieved "compatibility"—is a phony. The FCC is quite correct in declaring that, with the "compatibility" argument, color television could be postponed indefinitely. In its ruling, the FCC was influenced less by the interests of the present seven million set owners (who could easily be helped if RCA and the others would oblige) than by the seventy million who may still want to buy sets.

It is possible that color TV may be delayed by court battles, recourse to Congressional action, the new restrictions on installment buying or government defense licensing of strategic materials. But given an even break, CBS color will make its way. RCA tried a very few years ago to stop the 33 1/3 r.p.m., long-playing phonograph record from making headway because it was a CBS development. Eighteen months later, RCA-Victor went into the making of the LP records at 33 1/3 r.p.m. It is likely that once again its vice-presidents will have to accept the inevitable.

SAUL CARSON

Informed buyers know

WHAT'S IN A NAME

when they make a purchase!

Whether it is an expensive item like an automobile or a simple household cleanser, you need to know which brands are 'best buys'—whether advertising claims are supported by unbiased scientific tests. The 400,000 families who get CONSUMER REPORTS know which is the 'best buy' because every month this money-saving magazine publishes actual brand name ratings of a variety of products—tells which are 'best buys,' which are 'not acceptable' and why! Results are based on impartial laboratory or actual use tests on such products as—

automobiles
radio and television sets
household appliances
clothing and textiles
food products
household supplies

There are regular departments on health and medicine, consumer economics, records, and gardening.
Published monthly by Consumers Union, a non-profit organization, CONSUMER REPORTS brings you eleven issues of "facts you need before you buy"—PLUS the BIG 358 page ANNUAL BUYING GUIDE which is the December issue.

Send in the coupon for your subscription to

consumer **REPORTS**

You will receive the November Christmas Buying Issue, with ratings of automobile tires, men's hats, portable radios, automatic washing machines and other products.

CONSUMERS UNION
38 EAST FIRST STREET — NEW YORK 3, N. Y.

Please start my subscription to Consumer Reports with the next issue. I enclose

☐ check ☐ money order

$5.00 for 1 year $8.50 for 2 years

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

CITY ..... ZONE ..... STATE .....

NR 11/13

PRINTED BY NATIONAL PUBLISHING CO., 301 N ST., N.E., WASHINGTON 2, D. C.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It's House Plant Time!

TRANSFORM YOUR HOME INTO A GAY PICTURE OF SPRING-TIME BEAUTY THROUGH WINTER'S SNOW AND COLD

SPECTACULAR, EASY TO GROW HOUSE PLANTS

BUELL'S NEW

Gloxinias

MORE THAN 50

NEW, EXQUISITE COLOR COMBINATIONS AMAZINGLY BEAUTIFUL — the product of over 10 Years of Plant Breeding by *Albert H. Buell, America's foremost Gloxinia Specialist*

GIANT BLOSSOMS — AVERAGING 4-6 INCHES ACROSS
EXTREMELY FREE-FLOWERING AND LONG-BLOOMING

HEALTHY, STRONG ROOTED PLANTS

GUARANTEED TO ARRIVE IN PERFECT CONDITION

The ***easiest way to raise Gloxinias*** is to start with our unusually husky, sturdy plants. Well rooted and actively growing in individual pots so even the beginner will enjoy success.

Each plant is packed under Mr. Buell's personal supervision at his originating greenhouses in Eastford, Connecticut. Through years of specializing with Gloxinias, he has developed a special method of growing and shipping plants which assures their arrival in perfect fresh condition, regardless of distance traveled.

We are so confident you will be delighted with these new hybrids, that we promise to replace any plants which do not produce blooms worthy of your fondest expectations.

AVAILABLE IN MIXTURE ONLY

Prices—**Shipped Prepaid** to any part of the U. S.
1 plant—**95¢**, 2 plants—**$1.75**, 3 plants—**$2.65**, 6 plants—**$4.95**, 12 plants—**$8.65.**

HAND-POLLINATED SEED—*Buell's Giant Flowered Hybrids*

Personally blended by Mr. Buell to assure an even distribution of **all types** and color combinations. Order now for the fresh crop of seed harvested in October. Shipped promptly via first class mail, prepaid. Detailed easy to follow cultural instructions included.

100 seed	200 seed	400 seed
pkg. .....75¢	pkg. $1.00	pkg. $1.75

BUELL'S SPECIAL Gloxinia Soil

To obtain the same beautiful, spectacular blossoms which have given Mr. Buell his national reputation, use his **own Gloxinia** soil mixture—prepared by months of proper compositing and the careful blending of all important ingredients. Packed in special Polyethylene bags to insure a fresh moist condition—so necessary for healthy bacterial action. Detailed, *easy to follow* cultural instructions included.
(1 qt. of soil approximately 2 lbs.) is ample for potting 1 Buell Gloxinia plant, or for repotting 3 plants.

1 QT. bag—75¢	2 QT bag—95¢	3 QT. bag—$1.15
5 QT. bag—$1.75	10 QT. bag—$2.95	

Prepaid East of Mississippi. Add **25¢ per QT.** West of Mississippi

SEND FOR *Mr. Buell's BEAUTIFUL FULL-COLORED GLOXINIA FOLDER*—free of charge. Containing an important personal message for the house-plant gardener from Albert H. Buell. See for yourself the enchanting Gloxinia is all we say and much more. Included are other fascinating items of interest to every house-plant gardener; such as the plant bowls "THAT BREATHE". Write immediately for Gloxinia Folder G-500.

WORLD-FAMOUS IMPORTED
VAN TUBERGEN and VAN MEEUWEN

Amaryllis

VAN MEEUWEN'S SUPERIOR STRAIN

Imported direct from G. C. Van Meeuwen & Sons of Heemstede, Holland

IMMENSE FLOWERS OF BREATH-TAKING BEAUTY

PERFECT FORM — RICH SUBSTANCE — PURE COLORS

Each flower of a specific named variety is identical to the other, as these bulbs are raised from offsets, not from seed

The large exquisite flowers are distinguished by broad overlapping petals of excellent substance and noble bearing. Under moderately good culture individual blossoms will measure 8 to 9 inches across.

Bulbs are firm, well cured specimens, which will produce at least 2 spikes with 3 to 4 huge flowers per spike—and frequently 3 spikes!

EVERY BULB IS GUARANTEED TO BLOOM, and to produce flowers absolutely true to color and description. Unsatisfactory bulbs will be replaced at no charge, or refunded in full.

SPECIALLY TREATED BULBS for early blooming (referred to as "Herald Amaryllis")

Through years of experimentation Van Meeuwen has developed a method of treating Amaryllis so they will bloom by Christmas if planted in late October. When planted in November they will bloom during January. Every bulb of "Herald Amaryllis" (Specially treated) is guaranteed to bloom within 8 or 9 weeks after planting.

ALBINO—pure sparkling white
DIDO—soft-hued salmon
FABIOLA—clear light red
FAUST—rich brilliant red
IMPERATOR—deep orange red
JULIA—bright orange red
QUEEN SUPERIORA—rich blood red
ROSE QUEEN—deep pink, white center
SOLINA—soft salmon orange
PURPLE QUEEN—reddish purple

SPECIALLY TREATED BULBS for early flowering. Huge, exhibition size bulbs, **$5.50 each, 3 for $15.45.**
REGULAR BULBS for later flowering. Huge, exhibition size bulbs. **$4.95 each, 3 for $12.90.**

For a complete list of all Amaryllis we offer, including the world-famous VAN TUBERGEN imports, and HERMON BROWN'S ever popular American hybrids, send for our New House Plant Catalog offered below.

ORDER YOUR BULBS IMMEDIATELY so you can enjoy these magnificent blossoms shortly after Christmas. We will ship promptly the day after your order is received.

PREPARED ESPECIALLY FOR THE INDOOR GARDENING ENTHUSIAST

OUR NEW HOUSE PLANT CATALOG

For growing in your home—a complete line of imported, choice, rare, and unusual bulbs such as GLOXINIA TUBERS, AMARYLLIS, ACHIMENES, ISMENE, NAEGELIA, VALLOTA, REX BEGONIA, etc. . . .

For forcing in your home—a complete line of Springtime bulbs such as NARCISSI, DAFFODILS, HYACINTHS, etc . . .

A complete line of fascinating and unusual pottery and planters.

All sorts of necessary and useful accessories for the full enjoyment of indoor gardening.

Everything for the House Plant Gardener

Send 10¢ in Coin or Stamps for Your Copy

You can not find more Complete Protection than our Guarantee Offers You.

It is the most unusual guarantee in the entire horticultural field.

IN ADDITION to promising that all merchandise will be true to description and quality; and to reach you in absolutely perfect condition . . . OUR GUARANTEE extends **through the entire blooming season.** Any plants which fail to grow, or to produce good results and appealing colors, will be replaced at no charge.

Our certificate of guarantee accompanies every shipment.

Always look for this Emblem of Horticultural Perfection . . . The "Swan Castle" (Zwanenburg trademark of the *House of Van Tubergen.* Symbolizing more than 80 years of leadership in the field.

AMERICA'S FOREMOST BULB SPECIALISTS

The Barnes IMPORTERS

EAST AURORA 28 NEW YORK

ZWANENBURG
VAN TUBERGEN
HOLLAND

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED